ORIGINAL



1	DEFORE THE ARIZUNA CORPORATION C
2	COMMISSIONERS Arizona Corporation Commission SOR
3	JEFF HATCH-MILLER, CHAIRMANDOCKETED WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
4	MARC SPITZER MAY 1 0 2003
5	MIKE GLEASON KRISTIN K. MAYES DOCKETED BY
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE FORMAL Docket No. T-03471 A-05-0064
7	COMPLAINT OF ACCIPITER COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AGAINST
8	VISTANCIA COMMUNICATIONS, L.L.C.,
_	SHEA SUNBELT PLEASANT POINT, L.L.C. NOTICE OF FILING
9	AND COX ARIZONA TELCOM, LLC.
10	
11	The Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff") hereby gives notice of serving its
12	Second and Third Sets of Data Requests on Cox Arizona Telcom in this matter.
13	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 10 th day of May, 2005.
14	
15	
16	By Neven F. Ox
17	Maureen Scott
18	Attorney, Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission
19	1200 West Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007
	Telephone (602) 542-3402
20	
21	DA. 2
22	Original and 13 copies of the foregoing
23	filed this 10 TH day of May, 2005,
24	Original and 13 copies of the foregoing filed this 10 TH day of May, 2005, with: Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
25	Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission
26	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
2 0 27	Phoenix, AZ 85007
<i>41</i>	II

28

1	Copy of the foregoing was mailed this 10 th day of May, 2005, to:
2	Martin A. Aronson, Esq.
3	William A. Cleaveland, Esq. Morrill & Aronson
4	One East Camelback Road, Sutie 340
5	Phoenix, AZ 85012-1648 Counsel for Accipiter Communications, Inc
6	Charles V. Gowder, President
7	Accipiter Communications, Inc.
8	2238 Loan Cactus Drive, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85027
9	Michael W. Patten, Esq.
10	Roshka Heyman & DeWulf, P.L.C One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004 Counsel for Cox Arizona Telcom
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	Schora A. Amaral
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

COMMISSIONERS

JEFF HATCH-MILLER- CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

MARC SPITZER

MIKE GLEASON

KRISTIN K. MAYES



BRIAN C. MCNEIL Executive Secretary

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

May 6, 2005

By email and United States Mail mpatten@rhd-law.com

Michael W. Patten, Esq. ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

RE:

Staff's Second Set of Data Requests to Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC regarding the Formal Complaint of Accipiter Communications, Inc. Against Vistancia Communications, LLC, Shea Sunbelt Pleasant Point, LLC and Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC.

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064

Dear Mr. Patten:

Please treat this as Staff's Second Set of Data Requests to Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC, in the above-referenced matter.

For purposes of this data request set, the words "Cox", "you" and "your" refer to Cox Arizona Telcom, and any representative, including every person and/or entity acting with, under the control of, or on behalf of Cox Arizona Telcom.

For each answer, please identify by name, title, and address each person providing information that forms the basis for the response provided.

These data requests are continuing, and your answers or any documents supplied in response to these data requests should be supplemented with any additional information or documents that come to your attention after you have provided your initial responses.

Please respond within ten calendar days of your receipt of the copy of this letter. Please provide one complete set of all responses, in both hard copy and electronic format to each of the following addressees:

- (1) Constance Fitzsimmons, Paralegal, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007; cfitzsimmons@cc.state.az.us
- (2) Richard Boyles, Engineering Division, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007; rboyles@cc.state.az.us

Sincerely,

Maureen A. Scott Attorney, Legal Division (602) 542-6022

MAS:daa Enclosures

cc: Mark A. DiNunzio, Cox Arizona Telcom , Mark.dinunzio@cox.com

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064 May 6, 2005

STF 2.1	Please indicate whether the rates charged for telephone service by Cox Arizona Telcom in the Vistancia Development are included in the dues or payments made by each customer to the Development, its association, or Vistancia Communications; or whether Cox Arizona Telcom bills each customer in the Vistancia Development for services provided.
STF 2.2	If Cox Arizona Telcom bills each customer for service in the Vistancia development, please provide a copy of a customer's bill. You may redact customer specific information.
STF 2.3	Please indicate the names of the entities that Vistancia customers may make payment to for the telephone services provided.
STF 2.4	If a Vistancia customer has a complaint about the telephone service they receive, which entity first receives the complaint, Shea Sunbelt, the Homeowner's association, Vistancia Communications, or Cox Arizona Telcom?
STF 2.5	If a Cox Arizona Telecom customer in Vistancia has a complaint about the telephone service they receive, who are they instructed to contact? Please provide all written materials provided to Cox Arizona Telecom customers in Vistancia regarding actions to be taken if they have complaints concerning their telephone services.
STF 2.6	Please indicate whether Cox Arizona Telcom is required to report complaints received to either Vistancia Communications or Shea Sunbelt or any Association for the Development.
STF 2.7	Please indicate whether CoxCom constructed all of the facilities used to provide telecommunications services by Cox Arizona Telcom in the Vistancia development and whether all of the necessary facilities have been put in place.
STF 2.8	Please indicate what entities had input into the facilities to be provided and

the construction of those facilities, including whether any of the following

Please provide a summary of any conversations and/or meetings between Shea Sunbelt, Vistancia Communications and CoxCom or Cox Arizona

Shea Sunbelt, Vistancia Communications, Cox Arizona

had input:

Telcom.

STF 2.9

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064 May 6, 2005

Telcom regarding the provision of telecommunications service (local and long distance service) to the Vistancia development.

- STF 2.11 Which entity makes decisions regarding the placement or need for additional facilities to provide telecommunications services, Shea Sunbelt Vistancia Communications, CoxCom or Cox Arizona Telcom?
- STF 2.12 On page 2 of its Motion to Dismiss, Cox Arizona Telcom states that it has not refused to interconnect with Accipiter or to resell its service to Accipiter. If Cox Arizona Telcom received a request to interconnect with Accipiter or to resell its service to Accipiter, under what circumstances would Cox Arizona Telcom grant the request? What terms and conditions would Cox Arizona Telcom insist upon before interconnecting with Accipiter or another provider or before reselling its service to Accipiter or another provider?
- On page 3 of its Motion to Dismiss, Cox Arizona Telcom states that it is prepared to comply with Decision No. 60825, page 3, para. 18(g) which states: "...in areas where Cox is the sole provider of local exchange service facilities, Cox provide customers with access to alternative providers of service pursuant to the provisions of A.A.C. R14-2-112 and any subsequent rules adopted by the Commission on interconnection and unbundling. If Cox received such a request, how long would it take for Cox to honor it? Is Cox obligated to confer with Vistancia Communications or Shea Sunbelt before allowing another company to interconnect with it or have access to its facilities.
- On page 3 of its Motion to Dismiss, Cox Arizona Telcom states that it is willing to comply with Decision No. 60825 but that it has no unbundling obligation under federal law because it is a competitive service provider and that the Commission has no authority to impose such a requirement. Is Cox through this statement now saying that it will not comply with Decision 60825, page 3, para. 18(g). Please explain this apparent discrepancy in Cox Arizona Telcom's Motion to Dismiss.
- At page 4 of its Motion to Dismiss, Cox Arizona Telcom states that the property owner is not denying access; but that Accipiter simply does not like the terms of access required by the property owner. Please indicate whether Cox Arizona Telcom believes that an access fee may be so prohibitive that to would effectively amount to a denial of access for providers that could not afford the fee.

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064 May 6, 2005

- STF 2.16 How many license fees or payments has Cox Arizona Telcom or its affiliates made on its behalf to Shea Sunbelt and/or Vistancia Communications as a result of the provision of local and long distance service in the Vistancia development under Schedule 3.01 of the NELA. Please list each payment individually, the date the payment was made and which to entity the payment was made.
- STF 2.17 If Cox Arizona Telcom has not itself executed any of the agreements with Shea Sunbelt and/or Vistancia Communications, but rather CoxCom has, please indicate why CoxCom is not obligated to provide local and long distance telephone service under the various agreements and why CoxCom should not be required to obtain a CC&N from the Commission?
- STF 2.18 Please describe all ongoing activities relating to the provision of local and long distance service, that Cox Arizona Telcom, or another Cox affiliate on its behalf, are required to undertake under the agreements and the entity Cox Arizona Telcom, or another Cox affiliate on its behalf, work with or report to.
- STF 2.19 Please indicate any and all other fees paid by Cox Arizona Telcom, or CoxCom on its behalf, to Shea Sunbelt and/or Vistancia Communications and what those fees cover.
- STF 2.20 Please indicate any and all conditions that CoxCom had to meet on Cox Arizona Telcom's behalf in order to be a Mandatory Communications Provider of local and long distance telephone service.
- STF 2.21 Please indicate whether Cox Arizona Telcom or any of its affiliates paid the access fees specified in the NELA-CMA and the NELA-PAA. Please indicate the date such fees were paid and the amount paid.
- STF 2.22 Please indicate whether any representatives of Cox Arizona Telcom or its affiliaties have been in contact with representatives from Shea Sunbelt and/or Vistancia regarding the Accipiter complaint and the proceedings before the Arizona Corporation Commission, the Department of Justice and any other agency of the State of Arizona or Federal government.
- Please confirm that Sherry Tocco is employed by Cox Arizona Telcom or CoxCom. Please indicate what her responsibilities are with respect to the provision of local and long distance service in the Vistancia community. Please indicate whether any portion of her salary or her commissions are paid by Shea Sunbelt or Vistancia Communications.

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064 May 6, 2005

- Please provide copies of all materials provided by Cox Arizona Telcom or CoxCom or any other Cox affiliate to the United States Department of Justice relating to Cox or CoxCom's service or activities in Vistancia or their relationship with Shea Sunbelt, Vistancia Communications or any other Shea affiliate.
- Please provide copies of all materials provided by Cox Arizona Telcom or CoxCom or any other Cox affiliate to the Arizona Office of the Attorney General relating to Cox or CoxCom's service or activities in Vistancia or their relationship with Shea Sunbelt, Vistancia Communications or any other Shea affiliate

COMMISSIONERS
JEFF HATCH-MILLER- CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
MARC SPITZER
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES



BRIAN C. MCNEIL Executive Secretary

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

May 9, 2005

By email and United States Mail mpatten@rhd-law.com

Michael W. Patten, Esq. ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

RE:

Staff's Third Set of Data Requests to Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC regarding the Formal Complaint of Accipiter Communications, Inc. Against Vistancia Communications, LLC, Shea Sunbelt Pleasant Point, LLC and Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC.

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064

Dear Mr. Patten:

Please treat this as Staff's Third Set of Data Requests to Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC, in the above-referenced matter.

For purposes of this data request set, the words "Cox", "you" and "your" refer to Cox Arizona Telcom, and any representative, including every person and/or entity acting with, under the control of, or on behalf of Cox Arizona Telcom.

For each answer, please identify by name, title, and address each person providing information that forms the basis for the response provided.

These data requests are continuing, and your answers or any documents supplied in response to these data requests should be supplemented with any additional information or documents that come to your attention after you have provided your initial responses.

Please respond within ten calendar days of your receipt of the copy of this letter. Please provide one complete set of all responses, in both hard copy and electronic format to each of the following addressees:

- (1) Constance Fitzsimmons, Paralegal, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007; cfitzsimmons@cc.state.az.us
- (2) Richard Boyles, Engineering Division, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007; rboyles@cc.state.az.us

Sincerely,

Maureen A. Scott

Attorney, Legal Division

(602) 542-6022

MAS:daa

Enclosures

cc: Mark A. DiNunzio, Cox Arizona Telcom , Mark.dinunzio@cox.com

Docket No.: T-03471A-05-0064 May 9, 2005

STF 3.1 Please provide the total cost of communications facilities installed at the Vistancia development and the portion of the investment related to the provision of local and long distance service.